

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FILING DATE CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. YOR920000789US1 9522 09/902,728 07/12/2001 Arpan P. Mahorowala EXAMINER 7590 04/01/2004 Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz BARRECA, NICOLE M P.O. Box 19088 PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT Washington, DC 20036-3425 1756

DATE MAILED: 04/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
•	Ā		
Office Action Summary		09/902,728 Examiner	MAHOROWALA, ARPAN P. Art Unit
Period 1	or Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	ur the correspondence address
THE - Ext afte - If th - If N - Fai Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION consions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication be period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and the provision of the provision	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r t. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tatute, cause the application to become AE	reply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>c</u>	<u> 15 January 2004</u> .	
2a)[_		This action is non-final.	
3)	Since this application is in condition for all	owance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the merits is
	closed in accordance with the practice und	ler <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposi	tion of Claims		
-	Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the applica	tion	
حار٠	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>18,19 and 22-26</u>		eration.
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
· -	Claim(s) <u>1-17,20 and 21</u> is/are rejected.		
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
,	Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	nd/or election requirement.	
Applica	tion Papers		
	The specification is objected to by the Exar	niner	
, —	The drawing(s) filed on 10/18/02 is/are: a)		to by the Examiner
. 5/2_	Applicant may not request that any objection to		•
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	= : :	• •
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by th	·	``
•	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
	•	oign priority under 25 U.C.O. S	C 110(a) (d) or (f)
] Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for ı)	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	3 1 13(a)-(u) 01 (1).
a	1. Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received	
	Certified copies of the priority docum Certified copies of the priority documents of th		unnlication No
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the		·
	application from the International Bu		received in this National Stage
*	See the attached detailed Office action for a	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	received
	555 THE GREENING GERMAN OF THE BOTTON TO B	. not of the contined copies not	TOODITOU.
Attachme		-	
· 	tice of References Cited (PTO-892) tice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date
· <u></u>	ctice of Dransperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 ormation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SI	· —	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

6) Other: ____.

Art Unit: 1756

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

1. Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Claims 18, 19, 22-26 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 5.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because Figures 1B, 2B and 4B are not labeled.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities: "CI-6-alkyl, CS-2o" in line 4 and "CI-6-alkyl" in line 7. Appropriate correction is required.

Response to Amendment

- 4. The declaration filed on 1/5/2004 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Ngo reference.
- 5. The declaration states that Fig.1 of the application is dated July 13, 2000, which is prior to the filing date of Ngo. However the applicant's specification describes Fig.1 as a resist image after wet development. The applicant's claims require coating an organic underlayer and a photoresist, exposing, developing, transferring the image through underlayer to substrate and treating the image with a chemically reducing plasma. Fig.1 does not describe an image wherein an organic underlayer is coated, the image is transferred through the underlayer to the substrate and the image is treated with a chemically reducing plasma, as recited in the applicant's claims. Therefore the scope of the declaration is not commensurate with the scope of the claims.

Art Unit: 1756

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 1/5/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because the 37 CFR 1.131 declaration is ineffective to overcome the Ngo reference. However please note that the previous 102 rejection has been changed to a 103.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 1-3, 7-17, 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ngo (US6528432), (with Linn (US 5833758) cited to show inherent properties) in view of Allen (US 5985524).
- 9. Ngo discloses a H2 or H2/N2 plasma treatment in order to prevent organic ILD degradation. Figure 4 illustrates interlayer dielectric (ILD) 50 overlying a substrate. ILD 50 may comprise an organic carbon-containing low-k material. An organic carbon-containing low-k ILD 52, such as SiOCH (applicant's organic underlayer), is formed over layer 50 and patterned to form a trench using conventional damascene techniques (i.e. photoresist patterning, transferring photoresist pattern to underlying layer). Exposed surfaces are treated with H2 or H2/N2 plasma in order to reduce pattern degradation, prior to photoresist stripping. Metal is deposited in the trench to form conductive line 70. See col.5, 54-col.6, 26 and figure 5. Ngo teaches using a H2 or H2-containing plasma

Art Unit: 1756

in order to prevent degradation of a resist pattern in the subsequent processing steps. Ngo however does not explicitly state that this H2 or H2-containing plasma is a chemically reducing plasma. However Linn teaches that H2 is a chemically reducing plasma (col.3, 16-44), thereby teaching that the H2 plasma used in the method of Ngo is inherently a chemically reducing plasma.

Ngo is silent on the specific details the damascene patterning process, such as on the specific photoresist material and exposure radiations used and does not disclose that the photoresist material forms a stable, etch-resistant, non-volatile oxide comprising an element selected from Si, P, Ge, Al and B (cl.2), that the photoresist comprises a polymer having acid-cleavable moieties (cl.11), that the photoresist comprises a polymer formed by polymerizing one or more monomers selected from acrylate, methacrylate, hydroxystyrene, cyclic olefin and having silylethoxy acid-cleavable moieties (cl.12), that the photoresist comprises a photoacid generator (cl.13), or that the radiation comprises electromagnetic or e-beam radiation (cl.14), UV or EUV (cl.15) or x-ray radiation (cl.16).

Allen discloses a method for forming bilayer resist images for use in the manufacture of integrated circuits. Conventionally the top layer of the bilayer resist contains silicon, boron or germanium which enable the use of oxygen reaction ion etching in the image transfer step. However the incorporation of silicon in the photoresist leads to resolution degradation. This bilayer method improves resolution and critical dimension (col.1, 37-56,cl.17). The top photoresist imaging layer comprises a photoacid generator. The photoresist also may comprise a polymer formed by

Art Unit: 1756

polymerizing one or more monomers selected from acrylate, methacrylate, hydroxystyrene, cyclic olefin and having silylethoxy acid-cleavable moieties (col.2, 11-65, cl.2, 11-13). The photoresist is coated on an underlying organic layer, such as a low-k dielectric (col.3, 41-48, cl.9-10). The top layer is imagewise exposed to radiation such as UV, EUV, and x-ray (col.4, 13-21, cl.14-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use photoresist material (that forms an oxide) comprising a material selected from Si, P, Ge, Al and B, comprising a polymer formed by polymerizing one or more monomers selected from acrylate, methacrylate, hydroxystyrene, cyclic olefin and having silylethoxy acid-cleavable moieties, and comprising a photoacid generator, and to expose the photoresist using electromagnetic, UV, EUV or x-ray radiation, as the photoresist for the damascene patterning in the method of Ngo (w/ Linn cited to show inherent properties) because Allen teaches that these photoresist and exposure radiations produce a bilayer resist image with improved resolution.

10. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ngo (with Linn cited to show inherent properties) in view of Allen, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Ni (US 6465159).

The teachings of Ngo, Lin and Allen have been discussed above. Ngo is silent on the method and gases used for transferring the trench pattern to the organic low-k underlayer, teachings only that the trench pattern is formed using conventional damascene techniques. Ngo therefore does not disclose that the (trench) pattern is transferred by etching using passivating chemistry which generates hygroscopic

Art Unit: 1756

moieties such as a SO2/O2 containing plasma. Ni teaches that a conventional etch of organic low-k materials in a plasma chamber typically uses gases such as O2, CO2 and SO2 (col.1, 48-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to transfer the (trench) pattern to the low-k organic layer in the method of Ngo (w/ Linn cited) in view of Allen by etching with a plasma containing O2 and SO2 gases because Ni teaches that a conventional etch of organic low-k materials in a plasma chamber typically uses gases such as O2, CO2 and SO2.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicole M. Barreca whose telephone number is 571-272-1378. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (8:00 am-6:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Huff can be reached on 571-272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1756

Page 7

Examiner Art Unit 1756

3/18/04

mideBaren